

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above identified patent application is hereby respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks. Claim 3 has been canceled and claim 4 has been amended. New base claim 12 has been added. Claims 2 and 4-12 remain in the case.

It is again noted that the correspondence address is still incorrect and has yet to be updated. Having power of attorney in the above-identified application, please update the correspondence address and direct all future correspondence to the correspondence address and telephone on the last page attached hereto. If the Examiner requires a separate submission, please call the undersigned so this change can be accomplished prior to any subsequent mailing of a correspondence from the USPTO appertaining to this pending patent application.

A petition and Fee for Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and payment thereof for a two-month extension is attached hereto as is a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and payment thereof. This Amendment After Final is the

required submission. Please enter the RCE and consider the amendments herein.

1. It is noted that the rejection is final.

2-3. It is noted that claims 2-11 were remaining and that the Examiner believes new grounds of rejection have rendered the applicant's previous arguments moot.

4. The recitation of 35 USC 103 (a) is noted.

5. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 USC 103 over Fesmire et al, in view of Ehlers et al. Claim 2 has been amended herein. This is discussed hereinafter.

6. Claims 3-11 were rejected as above and further in view of Erickson et al.

Previous claim 3 recited a capacity to turn off the main circuit breaker, and other elements. It is well known in the electrical power distribution arts that the main

circuit breaker either supplies or interrupts power to all of the branch circuits that depend therefrom.

The limitations of prior claim 3 have now been combined with previously amended claim 2.

The Examiner asserts on the bottom of page 4, last sentence, that Fesmire et al reads on claim 3 (top of page 5), but excludes that portion of claim 3 where a recitation is included to turn off the main circuit breaker using a solenoid.

Later, on page 6, the Examiner points out how a solenoid is recited in claim 3 and that Erickson et al includes the use of solenoids.

None of the references cited teach or suggest turning off a main circuit breaker, thereby purposefully disabling all branch circuits simultaneously.

This is because none of the prior references were concerned with rolling blackouts and of providing a mechanism by which the utility company could turn off a particular main circuit breaker.

This provides an enormous benefit to all citizens when the need for a rolling blackout occurs in that the utility company (or individual) can turn off their own main circuit breaker for a period of time as needed without forcing a regional or local blackout.

At present the utility company is unable to interrupt the power in certain areas where key services are provided, for example, police, fire, medical, etc. With the instant invention, a means to disable all electrical usage by shutting off the main circuit breaker is disclosed that could be used to turn off the main circuit breaker in a residence or business that was located next door to a fire station, without affecting the fire station. Rolling blackouts, for residences that use the instant claimed invention, can eliminate the need for any excluded zone, because exclusions are accomplished based on individual users, rather than areas. This benefit is clearly explained

in the original disclosure on page 5, paragraphs 3-5, and elsewhere in the objects (third object, page 9).

Other dependent claims also recite other limitations that provide various other benefits, for example allowing users to select the times that their rolling blackout will be experienced as well as confirmation that it has taken place.

However, all of these instant benefits come from a consideration of the need for a system that ameliorates the suffering and inequalities of present-day rolling blackouts. The prior art is silent to this problem and silent to its solution. As the prior art inventors each had a duty to disclose the "best mode" for bringing forth their respective inventions, their silence is proof that such considerations and benefits were unknown and unobvious. The most basic embodiment of the instant invention is the ability to deliberately shut off the main circuit breaker.

This limitation (shutting off the main circuit breaker) from claim 3, which is included as part of base claim 2, is

absent from the prior references and would be absent from any applied combination thereof.

This provides a substantial benefit absent the prior art or any known combination of the prior art. Reconsideration of claim 2 and remaining dependent claims 4-11 is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 was amended only to correct antecedent basis.

New claim 12 includes all of the limitations of base claim 2, as amended above, and it also includes all of the limitations of claim 7 and intervening claims 4-6. As mentioned above, claim 12 recites elements not disclosed in any of the prior art references, namely shutting off the main circuit breaker. Consideration is respectfully requested. No new matter is added nor have any new issues been raised for consideration.

The prior art patents disclose monitoring the power usage at the main meter but they do not teach shutting off the main circuit breaker, as the instant claims recite.

Accordingly, remaining claims 2 and 4-12 are believed to be in condition of allowance and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

7. The new prior art made of record and not relied upon that is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure has been reviewed by the undersigned, but is deemed no more relevant than the applied references.

As all remaining claims 2 and 4-12 appear to be in condition of allowance, reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested, and a notice of allowance is courteously urged at the earliest time.

8-9. The applicant appreciates the reasons stated for the final rejection as well as the opportunity to communicate by telephone with the Examiner if necessary.

10. Please correct the correspondence address to that shown below.

2173 East Francisco Blvd.
Suite E
San Rafael, CA 94901
1-415-457-6933

Respectfully submitted,



Risto A. Rinne, Jr.
Reg. # 37,055